



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/671,605	09/29/2003	Jun-soo Jeong	1572.1132	8533

21171 7590 10/30/2006

STAAS & HALSEY LLP  
SUITE 700  
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

EDWARDS, ANTHONY Q

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2835

DATE MAILED: 10/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No. 10/671,605	Applicant(s) JEONG, JUN-SOO
Examiner Anthony Q. Edwards	Art Unit 2835

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 August 2006.
- 2a)  This action is **FINAL**.
- 2b)  This action is non-final.
- 3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4)  Claim(s) 1-31, 33-39, 41-47, 49-58, 60-62 and 66-68 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) 67 and 68 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6)  Claim(s) 1-7, 33-39, 41-47, 49-58, 60-62 and 66 is/are rejected.
- 7)  Claim(s) 8-31 is/are objected to.
- 8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10)  The drawing(s) filed on 27 December 2005 is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a)  All b)  Some \* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/21/06.
- 4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restrictions***

Newly submitted claims 67 and 68 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: applicant did not originally claim an invention directed to a monitor having an upper link member and a lower link member provided to be rotated with respect to the base member, respectively, and the monitor main body and the base member are folded such that the other side of the monitor main body and the upper side of the base member are facing each other.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 67 and 68 withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claim 8-29 are objected to because of the following informalities: claim 8 depends from claim 3, and it is difficult to ascertain the difference between the "base bracket" of claim 3 and the "first and second base brackets" of claim 8. Appropriate correction is required. Claims 9-29 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 8 and are therefore objected to for at least the same reasons.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 2, 7 and 36-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US2006/0176655 to Hillman et al. ("Hillman" hereinafter). Referring to claim 1, Hillman discloses a monitor (see Figs 47-50) including a monitor main body (4702) displaying an image thereon, and a base member (4714) supporting the monitor main body, the monitor comprising a base hinge (4732) coupled to the base member, a lower link member (4710) rotatably combined to the base hinge provided in the base member, a monitor hinge (4902) coupled to the monitor main body, an upper link member (4706) rotatably combined to the monitor hinge coupled to the monitor main body, a link hinge (4708) provided between the upper link member and the lower link member to allow the upper link member to rotate relative to the lower link member, and a first auxiliary link member (4912) disposed parallel to the lower link member at a first position deviated from first axes of the link hinge and the base hinge to connect the lower link member with the upper link member through the link hinge (see Fig. 50) and transmit a rotary motion from the lower link member relative

Art Unit: 2835

to the base member to the upper link member through the link hinge (see Figs. 68 and 69 and paragraphs 0597-0602).

Referring to claim 2, Hillman discloses a monitor as claimed, including a second auxiliary link member (4910) disposed parallel to the lower link member (4710) at a second position deviated from second axes of the link hinge and the base hinge to connect the link hinge (4708) with the base member. See Fig. 48 and the corresponding specification.

Referring to claim 7, Hillman discloses a monitor as claimed, a third auxiliary link member (4916) disposed parallel to the upper link member at a third position deviated from third axes of the monitor hinge and the link hinge to connect the monitor hinge with the link hinge. See Fig. 48.

Referring to claims 33-60 and 62, Hillman discloses a monitor as claimed. See Figs. 47-69 and the above rejection to claims 1, 2 and 7.

Referring to claims 66, Hillman discloses a monitor as claimed, including the first auxiliary link (4912) comprises a plurality of pins (5004, 5006) coupled to be deviated from a rotating center of the monitor hinge and a rotating center of the link hinge, respectively. See Fig. 50 and the corresponding specification.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hillman in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,422,951 to Takahashi et al. Referring to claim 3, Hillman discloses the invention as claimed, except for a base bracket to install the base member to a flat wall or an inclined wall. Takahashi et al. disclose wall mounting (see Figs. 2, 6 and 7) an electronic device (i.e., a telephone), wherein a base bracket (22/30) is combined to a base member (20) to install the base member onto a plane (61/62). Takashashi et al. also disclose the base bracket (22/30) comprising at least one hook (see lower portion of Fig. 7), and the base member (20) comprising at least one hook hole (see lower portion of Fig. 7) receiving the hook to latch the base bracket to detachably combine the base bracket to the base member.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the monitor of Hillman to include a base bracket, as taught by Takashashi et al., since the device of Takashashi et al. would provide the monitor of Hillman with a simple and secure means of installing the monitor onto a wall for overhead viewing.

Referring to claim 4, Hillman in view of Takashashi et al. disclose a monitor as claimed, including the base bracket (22/30) comprises at least one first combining hole (40b) to install the base bracket to the plain or inclined plane. See Figs. 6 and 7 of Takashashi et al.

Referring to claim 5, Hillman in view of Takashashi et al. disclose a monitor as claimed, wherein the base bracket (22/30) comprises at least one second combining hole (40a) to be combined with the base member. Although a third combining hole

Art Unit: 2835

corresponding to the second combining hole is not disclosed, it would have obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the base to include additional holes to provide better stability for the bracket.

Referring to claim 6, Hillman in view of Takashashi et al. disclose a monitor as substantially claimed, since it is well known in the art of monitor brackets to provide a well-known standard, such as "VESA," to allow the device to be used in a variety settings.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 8-31 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: regarding claim 8, the specific limitation of first and second base members, spaced-apart from each other and combined to the base member, such that the base hinge comprises first and second base hinge parts rotatably connecting lower opposite parts of the lower link member to the first and second base member, respectively, in combination with the remaining elements, is not taught or disclosed in the prior art references. Claims 9-29 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 8 and are would therefore be allowable.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 36, and 62 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 2835


**Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anthony Q. Edwards whose telephone number is 571-272-2042. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:30-3:00) First Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynn D. Feild can be reached on 571-272-2800, ext. 35. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

October 18, 2006  
aqe

  
LYNN FEILD  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER